

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 **United States District Court**  
7 **Central District of California**  
8

9 JARRET A. GREEN,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A.;

13 JPMORGAN CHASE & CO.; PAUL

14 SCHWAB; KARI JONES; DOES 1–10,

15 inclusive,

16 Defendants.

Case No. 2:14-cv-01703-ODW(JEMx)

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT  
CHASE BANK USA, N.A.’S  
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A  
THIRD-PARTY COMPLAINT [15]**

17 This action arises out of a failed partnership between two lawyers, Plaintiff  
18 Jarret A. Green and Neal S. Zaslavsky. After the partnership dissolved, Green alleges  
19 that Zaslavsky committed fraud and embezzlement by using the dissolved  
20 partnership’s credit cards for personal expenses including a lavish trip to Hawaii.  
21 Defendants enter the picture by allegedly failing to detect and halt the fraudulent  
22 credit-card activity. The Complaint contains numerous claims against Defendants  
23 including, but not limited to, state-law claims for fraud and intentional infliction of  
24 emotional distress and federal claims for violations of the Truth in Lending Act and  
25 Bank Secrecy Act. (*See* ECF No. 1, Ex. A.)

26 Notably, Green has not brought claims against Zaslavsky in this action. But  
27 Defendant Chase Bank USA, N.A.<sup>1</sup> (“Chase”) wants Zaslavsky brought in by seeking  
28

---

<sup>1</sup> Chase was erroneously sued as JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.

1 leave to file a third-party complaint for equitable indemnity and declaratory relief.  
2 For the reasons discussed below, the Court **GRANTS** Chase's unopposed Motion for  
3 Leave to File a Third-Party Complaint.<sup>2</sup> (ECF No. 15.)

4 Third-party practice is governed by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 14. "A  
5 defending party may, as a third-party plaintiff, serve a summons and complaint on a  
6 nonparty who is or may be liable to it for all or part of the claim against it." Fed. R.  
7 Civ. P. 14(a)(1). It is not sufficient that a third-party claim is related or arises out of  
8 the same set of facts. *United States v. One 1977 Mercedes Benz*, 708 F.2d 444, 452  
9 (9th Cir. 1983), *cert. denied*, 464 U.S. 1071 (1984). A "third-party claim may be  
10 asserted only when the third party's liability is in some way dependent on the outcome  
11 of the main claim *and* the third party's liability is secondary or derivative." *Id.*  
12 (emphasis added); *see also Stewart v. Am. Int'l Oil & Gas Co.*, 845 F.2d 196, 199–200  
13 (9th Cir. 1988); *Krainski v. Mill*, 356 Fed. Appx. 951, 952 (9th Cir. 2009). The  
14 decision to permit the impleader of a third-party defendant rests within the sound  
15 discretion of the trial court. *Sw. Adm'rs, Inc. v. Rozay's Transfer*, 791 F.2d 769, 777  
16 (9th Cir. 1986); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 14 advisory committee notes.

17 The Court finds that impleader of Zaslavsky is proper under Rule 14. As Chase  
18 points out, Zaslavsky's alleged fraud and embezzlement triggered all of the events that  
19 Green alleges caused him harm. Moreover, Chase limits its third-party complaint to  
20 claims for equitable indemnity and declaratory relief, requesting to transfer all or  
21 some of its potential liability for damages to Zaslavsky. Since Chase does not seek  
22 additional relief from Zaslavsky, the third-party action is entirely dependent on the  
23 outcome of the present lawsuit, and thus impleader is appropriate.

24 Moreover, impleader is unlikely to prejudice any of the existing parties to the  
25 suit as the Motion is unopposed and both Green and Chase will need to subpoena and  
26 depose Zaslavsky for this case. Zaslavsky is also likely to be called as a witness at  
27

---


28 <sup>2</sup> After carefully considering the papers filed in support of and in opposition to the Motion, the Court  
deems the matter appropriate for decision without oral argument. Fed. R. Civ. P. 78; L.R. 7-15.

1 trial. In addition, impleader will not confuse the issues at trial or cause undue delay.  
2 This action is in its early stages, and the facts surrounding Zaslavsky's liability in the  
3 proposed third-party action will clearly overlap with the facts at issue in this action.

4 Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** Chase's Motion for Leave to File a Third-  
5 Party Complaint. (ECF No. 15.) Chase shall file the third-party complaint against  
6 Zaslavsky **no later than 7 days** from the date of this Order.

7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8  
9 August 28, 2014

10  
11 

12 **OTIS D. WRIGHT, II**  
13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28